

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending. Reconsideration of the application based on the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' undersigned representative during the telephone interview held September 21, 2010 by Examiners Baig and Batis are appreciated. At the interview, it was agreed that the following arguments overcome the rejection.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Allen, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0121792 in view of Kennedy, U.S. Patent No. 6,754,192, further in view of Upton, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0093403. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The applied references would not have rendered obvious forwarding said routing information extracted by the notification means to the application, so that the application can exploit said routing information, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 6-8.

In rejecting Applicants' claims, the Office Action alleges that Allen discloses, in Fig. 3, that switching to another routing protocol will be received (forwarded) by applications 316, 318, or 320, and cites paragraph [0026] as support. The Office Action's analysis fails for at least the following reasons.


As discussed during the telephone interview, Allen merely discloses that an application layer 314 is coupled to a network layer 306. The application layer 314 includes a plurality of applications 316, 318, and 320. For each application 316, 318 and 320, a particular routing protocol 308, 310 and 312 is determined to work best based on trial and error or simulation. That is, Allen fails to perform the forwarding as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 6-8. Kennedy and Upton fail to overcome the deficiencies of Allen explained above regarding claims 1 and 6-8.

Accordingly, the applied references also would not have rendered obvious the combinations of features recited in claims 2-5 and 9 for at least the dependence of these claims on claim 1 and for the separately patentable features that these claims recite. Accordingly, and as was agreed during the telephone interview with the Examiners, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



William P. Berridge
Registration No. 30,024

Robert G. Bachner
Registration No. 60,122

WPB:RGB/rle

Date: September 22, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry of this filing;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461